

I STRONGLY believe that Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large parts of the PUBLIC airwaves are controlled by a few companies, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions, as well as those of Clear Channel, show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard.

I do not believe that the internet has significantly changed the landscape yet. Not even close to the point that it makes sense to endanger our very democracy. And I do believe that Media consolidation is threatening our democracy. Thank you.